

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Final Rejection of the pending claims in the Office Action December 2, 2005.

Claims 1 through 13 and 16 through 20 are currently pending in the application.

Claims 1, 5, 16, and 18 have been amended herein. Claims 14 and 15 were previously canceled herein. Support for the amendments may be found throughout the specification and particularly in paragraph [0023]. No new matter has been entered to the disclosure as the amendment clearly complies with 35 U.S.C. § 132. The amendments are to clearly distinguish over the cited art. The amendments are made without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections.

Objection to the Specification

Where the hyperlinks and/or other forms of browser-executable codes themselves rather than the contents of the site to which the hyperlinks are directed are part of applicant's invention and it is necessary to have them included in the patent application in order to comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, and applicant does not intend to have these hyperlinks be active links, examiners should not object to these hyperlinks. The Office will disable these hyperlinks when preparing the text to be loaded onto the USPTO web database.

M.P.E.P. § 608.01, Paragraph VII.

The e-mail and URL addresses in the specification relate to Applicant's invention and Applicant does not intend to have any hyperlinks be active. Accordingly, Applicant requests the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Anticipation Rejections

Anticipation Rejection Based on Choksi et al. (U.S. Patent 6,477,243)

Claims 1 through 13 and 16 through 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Choksi et al. (U.S. Patent 6,477,243) (hereinafter "Choksi"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as hereinafter set forth.

Applicant asserts that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.

Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim.

Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

After carefully considering the cited art, the rejections, and the Examiner's comments, Applicant has amended the claimed invention to clearly distinguish over the cited art.

Presently amended independent claim 1 recites a method of distributing a facsimile, the method comprising . . . receiving the facsimile, storing the facsimile on a storage media at a specific location, identifying an Internet enabled device associated with each intended recipient of the facsimile, the Internet enabled device independently selected from a group consisting of . . . e-mail enabled printers, embedded web server printers, e-mail enabled print servers, and web browser enabled printers, and notifying each identified Internet enabled device of the specific location for the saved facsimile.

Applicant asserts that Choksi does not identically describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of presently amended independent claim 1 in as complete detail as contained in the claim to anticipate the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicant asserts that Choksi does not describe the element of the claimed invention calling for "said Internet enabled device independently selected from a group consisting of: e-mail enabled printers, embedded web server printers, e-mail enabled print servers, and web browser enabled printers." Choksi discloses that "[t]he notification message may be transmitted to a communication device or address such as an e-mail address (e.g., associated with a subscriber e-mail account), a telephone, cellular or pager number or address, or even combinations of these devices and/or addresses." *Column 5, lines 15-20.* Choksi does not describe e-mail enabled printers, embedded web server printers, e-mail enabled print servers, or web browser enabled printers. Therefore, for at least this reason, Choksi does not anticipate presently amended claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Accordingly, presently amended independent claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2 through 4 are allowable for at least the reason of depending from allowable presently amended independent claim 1.

Presently amended independent claim 5 recites a method of distributing a facsimile, the method comprising . . . sending the facsimile to a registered address, retrieving the facsimile, determining a set of intended recipients for the facsimile from the registered address, saving the facsimile to a specific storage location on a storage media, and notifying

each of the set of intended recipients via an Internet enabled device or via facsimile of the saved facsimile and the specific storage location for retrieving the facsimile, the Internet enabled device independently selected from a group consisting of . . . e-mail enabled printers, embedded web server printers, e-mail enabled print servers, and web browser enabled printers.

Applicant asserts that Choksi does not identically describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of presently amended independent claim 5 in as complete detail as contained in the claim to anticipate the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicant asserts that Choksi does not describe the element of the claimed invention calling for "said Internet enabled device independently selected from a group consisting of: e-mail enabled printers, embedded web server printers, e-mail enabled print servers, and web browser enabled printers." Choksi discloses that "[t]he notification message may be transmitted to a communication device or address such as an e-mail address (e.g., associated with a subscriber e-mail account), a telephone, cellular or pager number or address, or even combinations of these devices and/or addresses." *Column 5, lines 15-20.* Choksi does not describe e-mail enabled printers, embedded web server printers, e-mail enabled print servers, or web browser enabled printers. Therefore, for at least this reason, Choksi does not anticipate presently amended claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Accordingly, presently amended independent claim 5 is allowable.

Claims 6 through 13, 16, and 17 are allowable for at least the reason of depending from allowable presently amended independent claim 5.

Claim 8 is additionally allowable since Choksi does not describe expressly or inherently at least the portion of the claim reciting a registered address selected from the group consisting of phone numbers, e-mail addresses, and uniform resource locator addresses.

Claim 9 is additionally allowable since Choksi does not describe expressly or inherently at least the portion of the claim reciting determining a set of intended recipients from a registered address comprising querying a database for determining a set of intended recipients.

Claim 10 is further allowable for depending from claim 9 and is additionally allowable since Choksi does not describe expressly or inherently at least the portion of the

claim reciting querying a database with a registered address to determine at least one recipient contact information address associated with the registered address.

Claim 11 is further allowable for depending from claim 10 and is additionally allowable since Choksi does not describe expressly or inherently at least the portion of the claim reciting recipient contact information address selected from the group consisting of phone numbers, e-mail addresses, and uniform resource locator addresses.

Claim 12 is further allowable for depending from claim 10 and is additionally allowable since Choksi does not describe expressly or inherently at least the portion of the claim reciting querying a database with a registered address to determine at least one recipient name associated with a registered address.

Claim 13 is additionally allowable since Choksi does not describe expressly or inherently at least the portion of the claim reciting saving a facsimile to a storage media associated with a uniform resource locator address, and assigning a unique path name to the saved facsimile.

Claim 17 is additionally allowable since Choksi does not describe expressly or inherently at least the portion of the claim reciting printing a facsimile at an Internet enabled device.

Presently amended independent claim 18 recites a system for distributing facsimiles, the system comprising . . . a facsimile distribution center for receiving facsimiles, saving facsimiles, and sending notification messages to at least one Internet enabled device, the Internet enabled device independently selected from a group consisting of . . . e-mail enabled printers, embedded web server printers, e-mail enabled print servers, and web browser enabled printers, a storage media for storing facsimiles saved by the facsimile distribution center, and a database for determining intended recipients for received facsimiles.

Applicant asserts that Choksi does not identically describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of presently amended independent claim 18 in as complete detail as contained in the claim to anticipate the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicant asserts that Choksi does not describe the element of the claimed invention calling for "said Internet enabled device independently selected from a group consisting of: e-mail enabled printers, embedded web server printers, e-mail enabled print servers, and web browser enabled printers." Choksi discloses that "[t]he notification message may be

transmitted to a communication device or address such as an e-mail address (e.g., associated with a subscriber e-mail account), a telephone, cellular or pager number or address, or even combinations of these devices and/or addresses.” *Column 5, lines 15-20.* Choksi does not describe e-mail enabled printers, embedded web server printers, e-mail enabled print servers, or web browser enabled printers. Therefore, for at least this reason, Choksi does not anticipate presently amended claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Accordingly, presently amended independent claim 18 is allowable.

Claims 19 and 20 are allowable for at least the reason of depending from allowable presently amended independent claim 18.

Applicant submits that claims 1 through 13 and 16 through 20 are clearly allowable over the cited prior art.

Applicants request entry of this amendment for the following reasons:

The amendment is timely filed.

The amendment does not require any further search or consideration.

The amendment places the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



James R. Duzan
Registration No. 28,393
Attorney for Applicant
TRASKBRITT, P.C.
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: January 23, 2006
JRD/dlm:lmh

Document in ProLaw.